



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

DATE MAILED: 07/28/2003

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/848,301	05/04/2001	Minoru Matsushita	P20596	9618
7055	7590 07/28/2003			
GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C.			EXAM	IINER
1950 ROLAND CLARKE PLACE RESTON, VA 20191			RAM, JOCE	LYN DEBRA
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3739	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
A shall a since A shall	09/848,301	MATSUSHITA ET AL.				
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Jocelyn D Ram	3739				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	•					
THE REPLY FILED 08 July 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoinal rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	S APPLICATION IN CONDITION oid abandonment of this applica a timely filed amendment which I (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely	N FOR ALLOWANCE. Ition. A proper reply to a n places the application in				
	EPLY [check either a) or b)]					
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire 1 ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of the under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the control of the contr	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE date on which the petition under 37 CF of extension and the corresponding amount of the shortened statutory period for reply	g date of the final rejection. IE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP R 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension unt of the fee. The appropriate extension originally set in the final Office action; or				
2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Officimely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 Common A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's	CFR 1.704(b). s Brief must be filed within the pe	eriod set forth in				
37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFI 2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be		f the appeal.				
- · · ·						
(a) they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);						
 (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below); (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the 						
issues for appeal; and/or						
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.						
NOTE:						
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection						
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).						
5. ☑ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☑ request for application in condition for allowance because: See	r reconsideration has been consections	idered but does NOT place the				
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered bed raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which were newly				
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendmen explanation of how the new or amended claims w	t(s) a)∭ will not be entered or b ould be rejected is provided belo)⊠ will be entered and an ow or appended.				
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:						
Claim(s) allowed:						
Claim(s) objected to: 4,6 and 7.						
Claim(s) rejected: <u>2,3,5,8-14 and 16-21</u> .						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 22-37.						
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is	a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapp	proved by the Examiner.				
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme	ent(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s).					
10. Other:						
		LINDÁ C. M. DVORAK SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER GROUP 3700				

Continuation of 3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): The applicant has pointed out the common ownership of the Sugiyama reference, and thus the 103a rejection is withdrawn. However, the 102 rejection over Sugiyama is upheld. Regarding the 112 rejection of claim 12, the examiner maintains that claim 12 is not further limiting. Claim 2 requires that the intermediate layer has a higher elasticity than the inner layer and the intermediate has a higher elasticity than the outer layer.

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The applicant's arguments do not overcome the 102 rejections over Sugiyama..